

REMARKS

The Official Action dated September 9, 2005 has been received and its contents carefully noted. In view thereof, non-elected claims 2-6 have been canceled, claim 1 has been amended and new claims 7-23 have been added in order to better define that which Applicant regards as the invention. Accordingly, claims 1 and 7-23 are presently pending in the instant application.

Initially, Applicant wishes to confirm the election of Species I wherein claim 1 is readable thereon.

Further on page 2 of the Office Action, claim 1 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6, 552,421 issued to Kishimoto et al. This rejection is respectfully traversed in that the patent to Kishimoto et al. neither discloses nor suggests that which is presently set forth by Applicant's claimed invention.

As can be seen from the foregoing amendments, independent claim 1 has been amended to recite a semiconductor device comprising a substrate having a main surface including a first area, a second area surrounding the first area and a third area surrounding the second area, a first insulating protective film that is provided on the first area and formed in a shape having no angles, a second insulating protective film provided on the third area, a die bonding layer formed on the first insulating protective film and the second area of the substrate, a semiconductor chip that is provided on the die bonding layer and has a bottom surface facing the die bonding layer, and a sealing resin covering the semiconductor chip wherein the bottom surface of the semiconductor chip covers the first area and a part of the second area. In reviewing the teachings of Kishimoto et al., it is noted that this reference, while being similar to that set forth by Applicant's claimed invention fails to include the second insulating protective film as set forth in accordance with the present invention.

In rejecting Applicant's claimed invention, the Examiner states that the second insulating protective film corresponds to a sealing material 2 of Kishimoto et al. However, the sealing material 2 corresponds to the sealing resin referred to in independent claim 1. That is, Kishimoto et al. does not have a second insulating layer as recited in accordance with Applicant's claimed invention. Furthermore, as can be seen from the foregoing amendments, independent claim 1 has been amended to recite a die bonding layer formed on the first insulating protective film and the second area of the substrate. The structure which may correspond to such a die bonding layer would be the adhesive 16 of Kishimoto et al. which, as the Examiner can readily appreciate, is located only on the second area. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that Applicant's claimed invention as set forth in independent claim 1, as amended, as well as new claims 7-14 which are either directly or indirectly dependent thereon, clearly distinguishes over the teachings of Kishimoto et al. and is in proper condition for allowance.

With reference now to new claims 7-23, as noted hereinabove, new claims 7-14 are either directly or indirectly dependent upon independent claim 1 and are in proper condition for allowance for the reasons discussed hereinabove.


With respect to new claims 15-23, new independent claim 15 similar recites a semiconductor device including a substrate having a main surface including a first area, a second area surrounding the first area and a third area surrounding the second area as well as a back surface opposite to the main surface, an insulating protective film formed on a part of the first area and a third area, a die bonding layer formed on the first insulating protective film and a part of the second area of the substrate, a semiconductor chip formed on the die bonding layer, the die bonding layer having a top surface and a bottom surface opposite to the top surface and facing the die bonding layer and a sealing resin covering the semiconductor chip wherein the semiconductor chip is located over the first area and a part of the second

area. Clearly, for reasons similar to those discussed hereinabove in detail with respect to claim 1, it is respectfully submitted that new independent claim 15 includes features which are neither disclosed in nor suggested by Kishimoto et al. Accordingly, this claim as well as those claims which depend therefrom, are believed to be in proper condition for allowance over such teachings.

Therefore in view of the going it is respectfully requested that the rejection of record be reconsidered and withdrawn by the Examiner, that claims 1 and 7-23 be allowed and that the application be passed to issue.

Should the Examiner believe a conference would be of benefit in expediting the prosecution of the instant application, he is hereby invited to telephone counsel to arrange such a conference.

Respectfully submitted,


Donald R. Studebaker
Reg. No. 32,815

Nixon Peabody LLP
401 9th Street N.W.
Suite 900
Washington, D. C. 20004
(202) 585-8000